|    | Case 2:23-cv-01762-JDP Document  | 6 Filed 12/26/23 Page 1 of 2        |
|----|--|-------------------------------------|
| 1  |  |                                     |
| 2  |  |                                     |
| 3  |  |                                     |
| 4  |  |                                     |
| 5  |  |                                     |
| 6  |  |                                     |
| 7  |  |                                     |
| 8  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT   |                                     |
| 9  | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA   |                                     |
| 10 |  |                                     |
| 11 | MATTHEW EDWARD NORTON,   | Case No. 2:23-cv-01762-JDP (HC)     |
| 12 | Petitioner,  | ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE                 |
| 13 | v.   | RESPONSE DUE WITHIN TWENTY-ONE DAYS |
| 14 | CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF<br>CORRECTIONS AND  | DATS                                |
| 15 | REHABILITATION,  |                                     |
| 16 | Respondent.  |                                     |
| 17 |  |                                     |
| 18 | On November 2, 2023, I screened petitioner's petition for a writ of habeas corpus and                |                                     |
| 19 | notified him that it failed to state a viable claim. ECF No. 5. I granted him thirty days to file an |                                     |
| 20 | amended petition. <i>Id.</i> To date, petitioner has not done so.                                    |                                     |
| 21 | To manage its docket effectively, the court imposes deadlines and requires litigants to              |                                     |
| 22 | meet those deadlines. The court may dismiss a case based on petitioner's failure to prosecute or     |                                     |
| 23 | failure to comply with its orders or local rules. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41; Hells Canyon Pres.         |                                     |
| 24 | Council v. U.S. Forest Serv., 403 F.3d 683, 689 (9th Cir. 2005) ("[T]he consensus among our          |                                     |
| 25 | sister circuits, with which we agree, is that courts may dismiss under Rule 41(b) sua sponte, at     |                                     |
| 26 | least under certain circumstances."). Involuntary dismissal is a harsh penalty, but the court has a  |                                     |
| 27 | duty to administer justice expeditiously and avoid needless burden for the parties. See              |                                     |
| 28 | Pagtalunan v. Galaza, 291 F.3d 639, 642 (9th Cir. 2002); Fed. R. Civ. P. 1.                          |                                     |
|    |  | 1                                   |

## Case 2:23-cv-01762-JDP Document 6 Filed 12/26/23 Page 2 of 2

Petitioner will be given an opportunity to explain why the court should not dismiss his case for failure to file an amended petition. Petitioner's failure to respond to this order will constitute a failure to comply with a court order and will result in dismissal of this case. Accordingly, petitioner must show cause within twenty-one days of the date of entry of this order why the court should not dismiss his case for failure to prosecute and for failure to comply with a court order. Should petitioner wish to continue with this lawsuit, he shall also file, within twenty-one days, an amended petition for writ of habeas corpus. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: December 26, 2023 JERÉMY D. PETERSON UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE